

Application No.: 09/741,684

Amendment After Final dated: January 16, 2007

Reply to Office Action dated: November 14, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 16 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 19-30 are pending in the application. Claims 19-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 19-23 and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Albrecht et al., hereinafter ("Albrecht") (US 5,821,494). Claims 19-23 and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ainslie et al., hereinafter ("Ainslie"), (US 4,761,699). Claims 24 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over either Albrecht or Ainslie. Claims 1-18 were previously cancelled. Claims 25-30 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection of claim 19, the Office Action asserts it is not readily apparent what structure of the slider bonding pad permits re-use. See Office Action dated 4/25/2006, paragraph 4. Applicants maintain this is an improper rejection, as it is readily apparent from both the claim and the specification it is not a *structure* of the bonding pad permitting such re-use, but rather the bonding pad itself ("...wherein the slider bonding pad enables the reuse of the *suspension* by removing the connection between a slider and the slider bonding pad with heat treatment".) See Specification page 3, lines 4-6.

Also, in its 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection of claim 25, Applicants submit the cancellation of claims 25-30 renders the rejection moot. Withdrawal of the current §112 rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants further submit the cited references do not teach, suggest or describe at least "[a] suspension comprising ... wherein the slider bonding pad enables the reuse of the

Application No.: 09/741,684

Amendment After Final dated: January 16, 2007

Reply to Office Action dated: November 14, 2006

suspension by removing the connection between a slider and the slider bonding pad with heat treatment" (e.g., as described in claim 19).

The Office Action asserts Albrecht and Ainslie describe the relevant limitation of claim 19, yet does not include any citation to a section in Albrecht or Ainslie allegedly describing the above limitation. *See* Office Action dated 11/14/2006, paragraphs 4 & 5. Albrecht is directed toward the disk drive art, but it does not describe at least a feature wherein the slider bonding pad enables the reuse of the suspension by removing the connection between a slider and the slider bonding pad with heat treatment. Ainslie is directed toward a slider suspension assemblies and methods for attaching both, but it does not describe at least a feature wherein the slider bonding pad enables the reuse of the suspension by removing the connection between a slider and the slider bonding pad with heat treatment. In order to support a proper §102(b) rejection, each and every limitation must be taught or described in the cited reference. Applicants submit the Office Action fails to cite to a portion of the cited references that teach or describe at least this limitation. As such, the current rejection is lacking.

The Office Action further asserts the claimed "heat treatment" is considered to be a manufacturing process limitation and/or disassembly step in a product by process claim. *See* Office Action dated 11/14/2006, paragraph 7. Applicants disagree. The limitation of claim 19 in question (quoted above) is directed toward a slider bonding pad, not heat treatment. The embodiment of claim 19 does not require heat treatment of the slider bonding pad at all. Therefore, it cannot be a product by process claim, as there is no process described necessary to produce the embodiment described in claim 19. Claim 19 merely describes an embodiment wherein the slider bonding pad is such that it may be reused under a number of given conditions,

Application No.: 09/741,684
Amendment After Final dated: January 16, 2007
Reply to Office Action dated: November 14, 2006

including heat treatment. For at least these reasons, the embodiment product of claim 19 is not a product by process; as such, Applicants maintain the current rejection should be withdrawn.

As the cited reference fails to teach or describe at least the above limitation, the current rejection is lacking and should be withdrawn. Claims 20-24 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim.


It is believed that this Amendment places the application in condition for allowance, and early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: January 16, 2007

By: 
Sumit Bhattacharya
(Reg. No. 51,469)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501